SD
11
.A1
A42
no. 457

United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service

**Policy Analysis
Staff**

Washington, DC

FS-457

# Effectiveness of Planning Coordination

## Volume 6

## Critique of Land Management Planning

# Effectiveness of Planning Coordination

## Volume 6

Prepared by:

*Thomas A. Fulk (Team Leader)*
*William G. Bradshaw*
*James M. Colby (Bureau of Land Management)*
*Melody S. Mobley*
*M. Kent Nelson*
*Marcus G. Phelps*
*Joseph E. Stutler*
*Tom Wardle (Nebraska Forest Service)*

**USDA Forest Service**
June 1990

# Executive Summary

This report presents findings and recommendations on the effectiveness of coordination with local governments, State and Federal agencies, and Indian tribes during the land management planning process. The report is based on 195 personal interviews, with both Forest Service employees and cooperators, and on written and oral comments of 223 participants in nine regional workshops.

Planning coordination to date has produced major successes and has forged many strong and productive relationships. The Forest Service and the groups and individuals who participated in forest planning have every right to take pride in those successes.

The recommendations address changes that should enhance the effectivenesss of coordination efforts. They describe a planning environment that is—

- Less complicated where possible.
- Customized to match the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved.
- Constrained to a shorter time period for future actions.
- Supportive of person-to-person dialog as a basis for coordination.
- Focused on results, not analysis.
- Considerate of time and energies of individuals and groups
- Enhanced by prepared study plans.

These recommendations for change are directed toward many places within the organization and throughout the coordination process. Each recommendation is as specific as possible concerning what and where adjustments could be made. Little indication of how a proposal might be attempted is included; as recommendations are accepted, other people will need to propose processes for attainment.

# Introduction

In February 1989, the Chief of the Forest Service initiated a national Critique of the agency's land management planning process. The objectives of the Critique were to review past planning, to develop recommendations for future planning, and to provide information to others who may be interested in a planning critique. The Critique was initiated and directed by the Forest Service as a review of its own operations. The goal is to make the land management planning process as efficient as possible.

This report is from the technical team assigned to study the effectiveness of coordination with local governments, State and Federal agencies, Indian tribes in the United States, and the Forest Service land management planning operations. The study team members were—

- **William G. Bradshaw**, Management Analyst, Office of Management Planning and Analysis, Forest Service.
- **James M. Colby**, Planner, Division of Planning and Environmental Coordination, Bureau of Land Management.
- **Thomas A. Fulk** (Team Leader), Director, State and Private Forestry, Pacific Southwest Region, Forest Service.
- **Melody S. Mobley**, Forest Resource Planning Specialist, Cooperative Forestry, Forest Service.
- **M. Kent Nelson**, Land Management Planning Group Leader, Northern Region, Forest Service.
- **Marcus G. Phelps**, State Forest Resource Planning Specialist, Northeastern Area State and Private Forestry, Forest Service.
- **Joseph E. Stutler**, Staff Officer, Inyo National Forest, Forest Service.
- **Tom Wardle**, Deputy State Forester, Nebraska Forest Service.

This report uses the word *cooperator* as a convenient reference to local governments, Federal and State agencies, Indian tribes, and native corporations. It also is used when referring to individual representatives of these entities.

# Study Process Description

The study of cooperative relationships in land management planning was based on interviews and workshops to obtain information concerning past coordination practices and to solicit opinions on the needs for change.

## Interviews

Two-person interview teams conducted interviews of 195 persons, consisting of Forest Service line officers, planning specialists, and interdisciplinary team members, along with representatives of local governments, State and Federal agencies, Indian tribes, and native corporations.

Forest Service employees were sampled in each regional office and on 18 national forests. Regional foresters selected the national forests where interviews were conducted, with the guidance that they should represent the spectrum of planning complexity in each region. Interviews of Forest Service employees on the sample units were guided by a list of 30 questions, provided to each interviewee in advance (see Appendix A). Generally, however, interviewees were encouraged to speak about past coordination practices, what worked well, what did not work, and what future improvements would be useful.

Cooperators located near the sample units also were interviewed. Priority was given to interviewing representatives of local government and Indian tribes.

Interviewees were informed that these interviews were confidential—that remarks would be reported and used but would not be attributed to any individual. The interviews were highlighted by candid, intense discussions. Key points of each interview were recorded by the interview team. In particular, the team noted high stress levels in the Forest Service employees who were involved in planning.

## Workshops

A forest resource consulting firm, George Banzhaf and Company, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, was retained to design, conduct, and report the results of nine workshops for cooperators. These workshops were designed to promote interaction and problem solving without Forest Service intervention. The workshop design made it possible to use the written opinions and recommendations of cooperators who were unable to be present during the workshop sessions, as well as those attending. Workshops were held in 1989 as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Milwaukee, Wisconsin | October 2–3 |
| Portland, Oregon | October 23–24 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Missoula, Montana | October 26–27 |
| Sacramento, California | October 30–31 |
| Juneau, Alaska | November 2–3 |
| Atlanta, Georgia | November 6–7 |
| Denver, Colorado | November 20–21 |
| Albuquerque, New Mexico | November 27–28 |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | November 30–December 1 |

Invitations to participate in the workshops along with background materials were mailed to 6,230 cooperators. This included all cooperators included on the national forest land management planning mailing lists and others who expressed an interest following several nationally issued "requests for participation."

There were 223 participants in the process, including 162 attending workshops and 61 with written comments.

The consultant prepared a draft report for each workshop and a final report that consolidated material from all workshops. Those findings and recommendations of the consultant considered appropriate by the technical team have been incorporated into this report. The full report is in the files of the technical team.

# Study Process Description

The study of cooperative relationships in land management planning was based on interviews and workshops to obtain information concerning past coordination practices and to solicit opinions on the needs for change.

## Interviews

Two-person interview teams conducted interviews of 195 persons, consisting of Forest Service line officers, planning specialists, and interdisciplinary team members, along with representatives of local governments, State and Federal agencies, Indian tribes, and native corporations.

Forest Service employees were sampled in each regional office and on 18 national forests. Regional foresters selected the national forests where interviews were conducted, with the guidance that they should represent the spectrum of planning complexity in each region. Interviews of Forest Service employees on the sample units were guided by a list of 30 questions, provided to each interviewee in advance (see Appendix A). Generally, however, interviewees were encouraged to speak about past coordination practices, what worked well, what did not work, and what future improvements would be useful.

Cooperators located near the sample units also were interviewed. Priority was given to interviewing representatives of local government and Indian tribes.

Interviewees were informed that these interviews were confidential—that remarks would be reported and used but would not be attributed to any individual. The interviews were highlighted by candid, intense discussions. Key points of each interview were recorded by the interview team. In particular, the team noted high stress levels in the Forest Service employees who were involved in planning.

## Workshops

A forest resource consulting firm, George Banzhaf and Company, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, was retained to design, conduct, and report the results of nine workshops for cooperators. These workshops were designed to promote interaction and problem solving without Forest Service intervention. The workshop design made it possible to use the written opinions and recommendations of cooperators who were unable to be present during the workshop sessions, as well as those attending. Workshops were held in 1989 as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Milwaukee, Wisconsin | October 2–3 |
| Portland, Oregon | October 23–24 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Missoula, Montana | October 26–27 |
| Sacramento, California | October 30–31 |
| Juneau, Alaska | November 2–3 |
| Atlanta, Georgia | November 6–7 |
| Denver, Colorado | November 20–21 |
| Albuquerque, New Mexico | November 27–28 |
| Salt Lake City, Utah | November 30–December 1 |

Invitations to participate in the workshops along with background materials were mailed to 6,230 cooperators. This included all cooperators included on the national forest land management planning mailing lists and others who expressed an interest following several nationally issued "requests for participation."

There were 223 participants in the process, including 162 attending workshops and 61 with written comments.

The consultant prepared a draft report for each workshop and a final report that consolidated material from all workshops. Those findings and recommendations of the consultant considered appropriate by the technical team have been incorporated into this report. The full report is in the files of the technical team.

# Standards and Requirements for Coordination

Coordination requirements are stated in laws, regulations, and policy. Early on, the technical team learned that there was no single reference source that documented the standards and requirements for coordination. To guide its work of evaluating past coordination practices and to serve as a discussion guide for interviews, a compilation of coordination requirements was prepared. This is included as Appendix B.

The need to coordinate efforts stems from numerous situations, some of which are illustrated as follows:

- Some State and local agencies have *legal jurisdiction* over Forest Service activities on National Forest System lands. For example, provisions of the Clean Water Act require the Forest Service to comply with State water quality management requirements. Also, the Forest Service must comply with substantive and procedural requirements of State and local agencies in air quality management.

- Some cooperators have *comanagement* responsibilities. For example, State fish and game agencies have responsibility for wildlife populations while the Forest Service manages wildlife habitat.

- Some cooperators *manage land* in tribal, Federal, State, or local government ownership that is near, or intermingled with, National Forest System lands. Coordination is required to ensure that land managed in these ownership classes is as compatible as possible. In some cases, coordination efforts help achieve management efficiency, such as in fire protection. Efforts made through mutual aid and resource-sharing agreements may reduce overall costs to the public.

- Some State and local agencies have *regulatory authority* over activities on private land near, or intermingled with, National Forest System lands. Exercise of these authorities is not a Forest Service responsibility; however, interagency consultation may result in improved public service, resource management, and environmental protection.

- Some Federal, State, and local agencies have *missions* affected by Forest Service decisions on National Forest System land. For example, State or local economic development agencies may be concerned with rural area unemployment, and Forest Service land management planning decisions may affect employment rates.

# Data and Findings

This section discusses the data collected through workshops and interviews and the findings derived by the techical team.

## Data

### Managing the Planning Process To Enhance Coordination

Many cooperators and Forest Service personnel cited ineffective planning, organizing, and scheduling of the planning process as barriers to effective coordination. A frequently mentioned example was the scheduling of requests for review and comment on draft plans. The lack of valid study plans for preparing forest plans made it difficult for cooperators to schedule their involvement and to arrange for the availability of personnel to complete the reviews.

Cooperators were sometimes given the same review time as special interest groups and individual members of the public. They felt their responsibilities merited more advance notice of reviews and sufficient lead time to complete them. These comments were of particular concern to agencies with comanagement responsibility for a particular resource, such as fish or wildlife. In cases where cooperators were notified in advance of schedules for developing forest plans, they were able to make adjustments that then facilitated their participation.

Several forests used helpful techniques to inform cooperators of coming events in the planning process—newsletters, postcard systems, and other techniques helped mitigate the many changes in scheduling. One region issued a planning guide that described the planning process and helped communicate the critical points for cooperator participation.

Several approaches were used within the Forest Service to assign responsibility for coordination. Some forest supervisors assigned responsibility for specific contacts to individuals on the interdisciplinary planning team. This helped ensure that no important contacts were overlooked. This also established a pattern of relationships that all participants understood. The active involvement of forest supervisors and regional foresters in planning and directing the coordination effort was noted by some planners and cooperators as the reason for their coordination success. One region felt that its use of a policy statement that defined the responsibilities of different Forest Service organizational levels for coordination with cooperators improved the process.

There were two types of planning coordination: technical and policy. Most efforts aimed at organizing coordination at the forest level tended toward the

"technical," with specialists coordinating with specialists. Forest supervisors were designated as regional forester representatives with specific contact responsibilites in States with more than one national forest. District rangers were frequently given responsiblity for county government contacts.

Coordination seemed to be more effective when the forest interdisciplinary team leader was a full member of the forest management team. This facilitated close involvement of the management team throughout the process, and management could then identify other opportunities to reinforce coordination efforts. Coordination was incorporated into the daily business routine and was more effective.

Training interdisciplinary team members in interpersonal communication skills was identified as a positive effort toward improving coordination.

Some cooperators felt coordination was enhanced when space was set aside in the forest supervisor's office for their use as a library/reading room and consultation center. This provided access to needed information and opportunities to informally interact with Forest Service planners. In some locations, cooperators mentioned that they were unable to access major planning documents.

### Consistency In Planning Model Definition and Rigor of Analysis

Cooperators cited differences in types of decisions made in forest plans and rigor of analysis from forest to forest as factors that inhibited coordination. This was frequently mentioned during interviews with State agency personnel from States having more than one national forest, especially where plans were prepared at different times.

Forest Service planners and cooperators cited frequent changes in the direction of the planning process as a barrier to coordination. The planning model was described by all as one that evolved significantly over time. The planning model was deemed defective because it was unclear where key decisions would be made—in regional guides, in forest plans, or in project implementation plans.

Some participants felt the agendas of several national groups also affected the consistency of planning model definition, as they sought to address fundamental issues, such as the social role of the National Forest System. This had the effect of changing the objective of forest plans from land-use allocation to one of resolving these broader issues. Coordination with cooperators was affected because decisions and analysis varied from forest to forest. Local agencies felt they had less influence than national groups. Many county officials expressed concern about the undue influence of nonresident participants on the local economic effects of forest plan decisions.

Some individuals commented that the use of analytical tools demonstrated that the Forest Service was evaluating tradeoffs and was willing to consider an acceptable range of alternatives. They felt that this improved the credibility of the planning process.

**Methods and Techniques of Coordination**

Interviews and workshops revealed that a number of successful coordination techniques were used. They are discussed throughout this section and in Recommendation 17.

**Joint Data Management and Information Sharing**

Forest Service planners and cooperators frequently cited joint data management as an effective coordination technique. Both Forest Service contacts and cooperators cited joint data management as helpful in meeting their planning responsibilites and efforts; it eliminated a potential source of disagreement and enhanced the resolution of other differences through personal trust and credibility.

Many cooperators said that joint data management provides a significant opportunity for improving future coordination efforts. This should include joint efforts to identify study needs and to finance needed data management.

In contrast to joint data management, mere data sharing produced mixed results in enhancing coordination. A problem described as inherent with data sharing is that agencies often had different criteria for collection, storage, interpretation, and use. Joint data management involved more than the exchange of resource inventory information; it also involved the development of joint criteria and a partnership of effort.

Using common analysis tools was useful in fostering coordination. This included analyses of resource demand information, forest inventory data, IMPLAN analysis results, performance of joint studies, threatened and endangered species habitat analyses and recovery planning, timber harvest studies, joint monitoring studies, and wetlands classification studies. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's threatened and endangered species management guidelines were cited as effective. These guidelines were previously developed through a joint effort with a State fish and game agency. Other examples of the use of common analysis tools involved water quality monitoring data, Soil Conservation Service soil information, and a State-developed geographical information system (GIS).

State economic development and recreation management plans helped coordinate the development of regional guides. They defined the potential contribution of national forest recreation opportunities and assisted in decision-making about the disaggregation of Resource Planning Act (RPA) targets to national forests.

**Participation in Planning**

Cooperators frequently commented on the value of their participation in planning as contrasted to "review of plans" and "input." They said that the most successful coordination occurred where planning partnerships were formed and they had an active role in planning work. Examples cited were planning team membership, participation in data collection and interpretation, preparation of analyses, drafting of standards and guidelines, and formulation of alternatives.

Intergovernmental Personnel Act agreements were used at several locations to place State fish and game agency biologists on interdisciplinary planning teams. The biologists selected had expertise in the management of an endangered species of particular concern in forest plans. This arrangement facilitated analysis, developed alternatives, increased the availability of needed expertise, and improved the understanding and credibility of the planning process within the State agency. The most successful arrangements involved the joint selection of the personnel involved.

State agency representatives frequently expressed their desire to be treated as partners in the planning process, and not as special interest groups. The rationale for this desire included their responsibilities for resource management, their regulatory authority over private land, their regulatory authority over National Forest System land (where applicable), and their expertise. This viewpoint was especially prevalent among State fish and game agency personnel who cited the interdependence of Forest Service responsibility for habitat management and their responsibility for animal populations. This concept also occurred when a State fish and game agency representative was a member of a regional interdisciplinary team to review standards and guidelines and forest plans.

Planning participation also was enhanced when groups of cooperators worked together as a task force to prepare analyses and reports. This process helped build ownership and credibility into the planning process and possibly prevented later disputes and appeals. Group work sessions provided the Forest Service with a valuable perspective, a broader-based identification of needs, the integration of effort, and information on potential tradeoffs. These participation techniques were effective because they helped develop an understanding of how the planning process affected cooperator responsibilities and developed credibility in the process and a sense of ownership in the outcomes.

One Forest Service region had extensive State agency involvement in developing the regional guide, preparing standards and guidelines, evaluating issues, listing RPA targets and definitions, and developing alternatives.

Some State agencies assisted in the planning process by providing the information used to build FORPLAN coefficients, to develop standards and guidelines, and to make allocation decisions. In States where information from State agencies was not used in modeling and there was less participation, cooperators expressed concerns about nonrealistic, standard coefficients. Some forest plans included alternatives based on cooperator proposals.

Some cooperators cited the value of early work sessions with Forest Service planners, rather than having them attend joint meetings with the public.

### Personalizing Relationships

Personal relationships were fundamental to effective coordination because they were the basis for communication, trust, and credibility. Coordination was described as most effective where personal relationships were in place well

before planning started, making planning coordination only another item of ongoing business.

County commissioners commented on the value of personal contact with Forest Service representatives, rather than merely receiving plans for comment. They said this offered an opportunity for discussion, developed mutual understanding, and made effective use of time by focusing on issues relevant to their responsibilities. The value of personal relationships in achieving coordination is illustrated by the resolution of several forest plan appeals through informal discussion. In fact, some cooperators said their appeals were made not to solve the issues raised in the appeal, but to force the opening of communication between the parties.

Efforts to coordinate forest planning revealed the need to establish new relationships with cooperators. The Forest Service was credited by many participants for using the planning effort to establish closer working relationships.

**Continuity of Coordination**

Cooperators commented that frequent personnel changes within the Forest Service contributed to a lack of continuity in the planning process. They attributed this to an excessive length of time spent completing forest plans. Effective coordination resulted from established working relationships, credibility, and trust. Coordination was impaired where it became necessary to establish new relationships, particularly if controversial issues were involved. The quality and effectiveness of interagency coordination were highest where there was a previously established, ongoing program of interagency communication prior to land management planning.

The planning process also provided an opportunity to establish new cooperative relationships. In fact, coordination initiated during forest planning often continued after the plans were finalized. A major, unintended benefit of the planning process has been the creation of long-term working relationships.

Another unexpected result of the planning effort involved discussions between specialists of different disciplines, within the Forest Service and across agency lines. The planning process required an integrated view of resource management, and interdisciplinary discussions strengthened this basic approach. It was noted in one instance, however, that long-term relationships were damaged by the perfunctory response given by the Forest Service to the major input of another agency.

Concern was expressed by some Forest Service personnel and cooperators that monitoring of completed plan implementation was so poor that future coordination efforts were negatively impacted. They said future coordination would be difficult without joint data on the effects of plan implementation.

**Predetermined Outcomes**

Workshops and interviews revealed opinions held by some individuals that coordination efforts were not credible because the Forest Service had

established predetermined outcomes to the planning process. Two examples were cited—one a general case and the other specific.

The general example of predetermined outcomes cited involved the amount of flexibility in decisionmaking after draft plans were issued for review. Persons commenting on this said the Forest Service was reluctant to exercise flexibility in decisionmaking because of past investments in developing preferred alternatives. They said the behavior of Forest Service representatives implied that it was too much work to "do things over." Efforts often seemed to "sell" the preferred alternative rather than to achieve coordination with other agency plans and programs.

A specific case of predetermined outcomes was frequently mentioned by both Forest Service personnel and cooperators. It involved the determination of allowable sale quantities in forest plans. Persons commenting on this aspect of planning felt that decisionmaking options were limited by predetermined allowable sale quantity levels and that decisionmaking was unduly constrained by the need to meet these controlling levels. This tended to limit the objectivity and responsiveness of Forest Service decisionmakers in considering other viewpoints, so it was a barrier to effective coordination.

It also was noted that review of plans by the Chief's staff and the Department of Agriculture served to reinforce the belief that predetermined allowable sale quantity levels were controlling the outcome of the planning process.

### Forest Service Attitudes About Coordination

Attitudes about coordination frequently reflected the values and beliefs of the forest supervisor. In some cases, the participation of cooperators was valued, viewed as essential, and solicited. In other cases, coordination was interpreted to mean simply providing an opportunity for cooperators to comment.

Attitudes about decisionmaking also differed significantly. Some Forest Service line officers expressed the view that decisions about national forest management were their responsibility and prerogative. Others said that decisionmaking was a Forest Service responsibility, but welcomed the participation of other agency representatives. Interviews of cooperators clearly reflected their understanding of the local line officers' viewpoints on coordination and decisionmaking.

### Interregional and Interforest Issues

Several resource management issues addressed in forest plans spanned the boundaries of Forest Service administrative regions or those of other agencies. Special coordination arrangements were needed in these cases. An example is the Columbia River Indian fishing rights issue involving three Forest Service regions, four States, and several national forests. Additional examples concerned air quality management of airsheds spanning two or more regions and wildlife habitat management. Resource management issues also involved other countries, such as Canada in the case of the woodland caribou and Mexico in fire management.

In the case of the Columbia River Indian fishing rights issue, an effective coordination arrangement was developed when deputy regional foresters from each region organized as a steering committee to provide coordination within the Forest Service and with affected cooperators.

Planning coordination was more difficult where a national forest was in several administrative regions of other agencies. Coordination was enhanced when the other agency appointed a spokesperson to coordinate interaction with the Forest Service.

Coordination with regional planning bodies of a State was important in the development of many forest plans. Several State agencies suggested the importance of analysis areas wider than the forest boundaries, because the zone of impact was wider. Although analysis focused on a specific land area within the boundary, an analysis of needs, impacts, and benefits was needed on a broader, regional scope. This was especially important with States having a significant economic dependency on the production of national forest resources. States found it difficult to evaluate the effects of forest plan decisions on their economic regions when forest plans were issued sequentially rather than concurrently, because data were not available for aggregation.

Several State-wide issues were effectively coordinated when individuals in the Forest Service regional office were designated to lead the coordination effort or where one forest supervisor in the State was designated to lead the coordination effort.

### Mission Differences Between Agencies

Mission differences between the Forest Service and State agencies affected coordination. The most outstanding example was the difference between the Forest Service multiple-use management mission and the single-resource advocacy mission of State fish and game agencies. Coordination problems arose because the State agency advocated the subordination of all resource management to wildlife while the Forest Service pursued multiple-use management objectives. Final decisions not in accord with a single-use mission created negative feelings about the adequacy of coordination, despite the amount and quality of participation in the planning process.

Many persons commented on the difference between parties having a shared responsibility for some aspect of forest management and those having an interest in it. Special coordination measures were frequently advocated for agencies with shared responsibilities. These included proposals that the Forest Service provide draft materials to other agencies for review prior to release to the general public to avoid surprises, greater use of agency-specific briefings, closer participation in the planning process, and joint data management (including monitoring).

One issue raised involved State agency responsibility for the regulation of private land use in settings of mixed National Forest System and private lands. State agency representatives said that standards and guidelines in forest plans

tended to set standards that forced them to use similar requirements as regulatory standards on private lands. This caused problems for the State agency when they were not prepared to use the same standards on private land, or when private landowners objected to these requirements.

This issue was of particular concern in the area of cumulative watershed effects when thresholds of acceptability would be reached by some planned activity on either private land or National Forest System land. The use of different standards and the absence of established processes for priority setting between ownerships resulted in the Forest Service being asked to resolve conflicts by mitigating land management practices that occurred on private land. As a result, cases were cited where decisions were made to indefinitely defer timber harvest on national forest land.

Many participants suggested the establishment of special coordination procedures with agencies sharing responsibility with the Forest Service for resource management.

**Roles and Responsibilities of Participants**

Cooperators, in many instances, did not have a good understanding of their role in the land management planning process and of the importance of their participation. Because the planning process was new, it was unclear what the content, analysis level, and decisions to be made were in forest plans and other planning documents.

Because the planning process was initially ambiguous, some agencies had unfulfilled expectations about their influence on decisions. Unrealistic expectations arose because involvement in the planning process was taken to mean a decision guarantee.

Some cooperators expressed satisfaction with coordination practices but went on to express disagreement with plan decisions. In those instances, they acknowledged that professional differences in decisionmaking were satisfactory and that the Forest Service coordination efforts had resulted in a better plan.

**Organization of State Agencies**

Differences in State agency organizations and in State policy development procedures made coordination difficult. A key example cited was a governor's position letter on a forest plan that enclosed letters from State agency heads expressing conflicting viewpoints on the plan. States varied greatly in their ability to formulate a single, consistent response to forest plans. However, there also were problems with multiple responses in States with a well-established single contact point; individual agencies and units of agencies still presented conflicting comments.

Sometimes conflicting viewpoints of State agency representatives reflected political differences, such as an attorney general of one party and a governor

of another. Coordination also was affected by the organization and management styles of State agencies. In some situations, coordination was very effective in reaching agreement at the regional or field level of a State agency, but was not effective at the State level. The reverse situation also occurred. In some cases, specialists within a State agency also expressed conflicting viewpoints, and they remained unresolved.

On the positive side, some States had well-developed policy coordination procedures, and conflicting State agency viewpoints were resolved internally before the State's official position was developed.

**Complexity of the Planning Process**

Process complexity was the most frequently mentioned barrier to effective coordination. Some persons cited process complexity as a factor that caused the Forest Service to focus internally, to the exclusion of external relationships.

The complexity of the FORPLAN model caused frustration in discussions on how plan decisions were made. Cooperators and Forest personnel commented that FORPLAN was not understood by the Forest Service or others. One Forest Service employee mentioned that forest planning at first was 20 percent coordination and 80 percent FORPLAN analysis. This individual felt that, given the nature of resource management today, the proportions should have been 80 percent coordination and 20 percent analysis. Many cooperators expressed similar viewpoints.

Many persons commented on the danger of focusing on process details and losing sight of the important decisions.

Use of complex, technical language discouraged coordination and participation. Cooperators said they often could not understand what the Forest Service intended, what they were being asked for, how it would affect them, or the implications of planning documents. Documents were often described as much too wordy and as communication failures.

**Elected Officials**

Numerous elected officials expressed concern about "being treated as an interest group." They felt that as elected representatives of a constituency, they were entitled to different consideration in the coordination process from individual members of the public.

Briefings conducted for boards of county commissioners benefited the coordination with local elected officials. This technique was useful because it eliminated detailed reading of planning documents, permitted time to be focused on key points of interest, and provided an opportunity for interaction.

**Mediation and Negotiation of Disputes**

Cooperators used the administrative appeals process to register disputes with forest plan decisions. This established a coordination process that continued

after the final plans were issued, particularly when mediation and negotiation were used to resolve appeals.

Interviews of Forest Service planners and line officers revealed strong support for the use of mediation and negotation to resolve appeals arising from land management planning. Although this was a generally held view, there were a few notable exceptions, as some described mediation and negotiation as "illegal," "undesirable," and "to be avoided at all costs." The rationale offered for these opinions was the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), which was cited as giving decisionmaking authority to the Forest Service. It was felt that mediation, in particular, amounted to an illegal sharing of decisionmaking authority not intended by Congress.

There is an unexplained dichotomy in the opinions of Forest Service line officers about use of mediation and negotiation to achieve consensus. As noted, there was generally strong support for using these techniques in appeals resolution; however, there was much less support for mediation, negotiation, or other consensus-building techniques during plan development and prior to decisionmaking. It seems that mediation and negotiation are viewed as acceptable techniques for resolving disputes raised in appeals, but are not viewed as acceptable for resolving disputes raised during the coordination process.

### Agencies With Comanagement Responsibilities

State fish and game departments were key State agencies in the planning process, because of their comanagement responsibility in which the Forest Service manages habitat and the State manages populations. Special measures were often used to achieve coordination, and disputes about forest plans were often related to the degree of coordination success. The effectiveness of coordination between the Forest Service and State fish and game agencies varied greatly.

### Indian Treaty Rights

Indian treaty rights on National Forest System land was an issue raised as a coordination point by a number of tribal representatives, who described treaty rights as "preemptive" or having precedence over other land-use allocations.

Forest Service representatives also expressed views on the subject. Not all Forest Service line officers or planners viewed Indian treaty rights as preemptive, with priority over other uses, although some did.

### Indian Religious and Traditional Uses

Numerous tribal representatives commented on the coordination with the Forest Service in the matter of religious and traditional uses of National Forest System land. Reactions were mixed, and comments on this subject revealed opinions ranging from high levels of satisfaction to extreme dissatisfaction.

Forest Service planners also commented on this issue, stating that it was often difficult to coordinate with Indian tribes on this subject. First, in some tribes, elected Indian leaders did not express the same views as religious and

traditional leaders. Planners found it difficult to resolve issues in contention between tribal factions and to determine the identity of religious and traditional leaders.

Tribal representatives commented on the security of information provided to the Forest Service, particularly regarding the location of traditional or religious use sites. They feared that the release of this information would make it available to the public, sites would be degraded, or there would be increased competition for resource use. Forest Service planners found it difficult to protect these sites or provide for these uses if they could not be located on a map.

### Organizational and Cultural Differences

Organizational and cultural differences were cited as influences on the coordination between the Forest Service and Indian tribes. Forest Service personnel often had difficulty coordinating with the correct parties because they did not know whom should be contacted in the different cultural groups. Communication with tribal elders (the identification of whom was uncertain) was often by word of mouth. Letters of notification and scheduling of planning meetings and other dates were frequently not workable in fostering needed coordination. Planning timetables tended to discourage the development of patience and tolerance necessary to recognize and handle these differences.

## Findings

The technical team developed the following findings from the preceding workshop and interview data. Coordination was most effective when—

- Mission differences between cooperators were known and respected.
- There was trust between participants, and the planning process had credibility.
- Interforest and interregional issues were specifically addressed during planning.
- States provided integrated policy positions on forest plans.
- Schedules for participation were known and accommodated.
- The roles and responsibilities of participants were understood prior to initiating planning, and expectations were fulfilled.
- Processes were appropriate to tribal cultures, and tribal interests were understood and considered.
- Indian treaty rights were acknowledged in forest plans.
- There was continuity of Forest Service and cooperator personnel throughout the development of forest plans.

- Cooperators and Forest Service personnel knew what kinds of decisions were appropriate in forest plans.
- Forests used methods that maintained open dialog throughout the planning process.
- The expertise and responsibilities of cooperators were acknowledged, and they were partners in the planning process rather than merely reviewers of documents.
- Coordination was viewed by Forest Service personnel as a worthy effort.

The ideal planning environment of the future would be characterized by the predominance of these conditions.

# Recommendations

The following recommendations were developed to address the coordination problem areas identified by participants in interviews and workshops. They also provide for the continued use of effective coordination techniques.

## Recommendation 1

***Require the preparation and approval of a detailed study plan to guide the development of each national forest land management plan.***

Implementation of this recommendation would necessitate changes in policy and procedural guidelines for land management planning to require the development of study plans with specified content and their approval. Changes are needed in FSM 1922.04b and FSH 1909.12.

The study plan would specify the use of management resources, time, people, and money to prepare forest plans. In addition to other information, the study plan would include a detailed description of procedures, responsibilities, schedules, and agreements for coordination. The schedule for input from the State clearinghouse (single point of contact) would be specified. Cooperator involvement should be encouraged in the development of the study plans. Study plans would be approved by the regional forester with the authority for forest plan approval. Regional forester review would include a determination of the adequacy of interforest and interregional coordination measures. The study plan must specify coordination procedures for Indian tribes (see also Recommendation 11). The study plan also should stress the use of successful coordination techniques as described in Recommendation 17.

This recommendation responds to several concerns, including the inability of cooperators to plan their participation because of scheduling uncertainties, defiencies in interforest and interregional coordination, difficulties with short turnaround times, lack of training in coordination and communication techniques, omissions or inadequacies in coordination, and lack of accountability.

It is expected that detailed study plans would facilitate the participation of cooperators by communicating needed information about management of the planning process early on and during development of the forest plan. It also would establish realistic expectations for cooperator participation. Interforest and interregional coordination would likely be improved.

## Recommendation 2

***Eliminate requirements for a land management plan alternative that addresses RPA targets disaggregated to the forest level.***

Implementation of this recommendation would require an amendment to regulations in 36 CFR 219.12(f)(6) and in corresponding policy and procedural guidelines.

Current regulations and policy require that regional guides disaggregate RPA targets for commodity outputs to national forests (36 CFR 219.9(a)(3)) and that each forest plan include at least one alternative that provides for realization of these target levels.

This recommendation responds to strong perceptions that the planning process was constrained by predetermined outcomes in the form of disaggregated target levels for commodity outputs. This was identified as a significant barrier to coordination because it affected the credibility of the planning process. Cooperators questioned the extent their input could impact plan decisions, and they had negative perceptions about Forest Service objectivity in considering non-commodity values in the planning process.

It is expected that implementation of this recommendation would assist in the development of planning process credibility, would mitigate negative perceptions, and could develop more support for plan decisions.

## Recommendation 3

***Strengthen the analysis of cooperator comments, the documentation on how they were used, and the feedback process.***

Implementation of this recommendation would require revision of regulations in 36 CFR 219.7(e) and corresponding policy and procedural guidelines. Provisions for its accomplishment also must be included in the study plans referred to in Recommendation 1.

This action recognizes that decisions made in forest plans may impact the responsibilities, missions, and plans of cooperators and that special consideration is needed to mitigate the potential effects of Forest Service decision-making. Documentation would include a discussion of how local and national interests were integrated for the purposes of coordination.

This recommendation responds to concerns about the absence or inadequacy of communication about decisions that would affect the work of other agencies with joint (threatened and endangered species), comanagement (wildlife habitat and population management), or regulatory (air and water resource management) responsibilities on National Forest System lands, adjacent private land, or missions that are otherwise related. Concerns also were expressed that there were process inconsistencies between forests and that use of other agency input in the decision process was not trackable.

It is expected that the implementation of this recommendation would encourage communication between agencies with related interests and would facilitate the development of coordinated management strategies.

## Recommendation 4

***Prepare a concise description of the Forest Service planning system, which names components, their function, decisions made in each, and linkages between components.***

Implementation of this recommendation would require preparation of a brief publication and edits to existing policy and procedural guidelines to ensure consistency of content and description. This publication would be given to cooperators. (This recommendation is related to Recommendation 14.)

There is no single, concise, easily understood publication that describes the interrelationships of the RPA Assessment, the RPA Program, regional guides, forest plans, management area analyses, project plans, special area plans, and implementation plans. Decisions made in each of these levels of planning are unclear to other agencies, Indian tribes, or Forest Service employees; linkages between components of the planning system are not clearly described or understood; and there is real and perceived inconsistency in the types of decisions made by various Forest Service units in these planning process components and in their use of these components.

This recommendation responds to concerns about inconsistency among Forest Service units in planning, including types of plans made, decisions made, depth of analysis, target-setting function, and linkages between components. This inconsistency was identified as a significant barrier to coordination, particularly in States with more than one national forest.

Implementation of this recommendation would provide a tool for communicating needed information about the Forest Service planning process both within the agency and externally, and it would assist in achieving consistency in applying the planning system. It would facilitate the participation of cooperators by clearly identifying the key points for their participation. Use of management resources by cooperators would be enhanced, and their participation could be more effectively focused.

## Recommendation 5

***Orient coordination activities more toward decisions being made in forest plans and less toward the analysis tools used in planning.***

Implementation of this recommendation would involve the identification of meaningful opportunities for coordination during the initial meeting required by 36 CFR 7(d) and their inclusion in the study plan (Recommendation 1).

This recommendation focuses coordination activities on areas where cooperators can most influence plans and avoids concentration of effort on inconsequential details. Implementation of this recommendation would enable the Forest Service and cooperators to focus on the kinds of decisions made in forest plans (Recommendation 4).

This recommendation responds to several concerns, including the complexity of the planning process as a barrier to communication and the ineffective

allocation of people, time, and money by the Forest Service and cooperators. Implementation of this recommendation could provide an opportunity for more effective coordination of decisions with cooperators.

## Recommendation 6

***Establish a formal coordination step between issuance of draft forest plans and final forest plans.***

Implementation of this recommendation would require revision of regulations in 36CFR 219.7(d) and corresponding policy and procedural guidelines.

It is envisioned that this step would apply only to agencies with joint (threatened and endangered species), comanagement (wildlife habitat and population management), or regulatory (air and water resource management) resource management responsibilities. Many of these agencies used the administrative appeals process to force an extension of the planning process and thereby create additional opportunity for communication, coordination, and negotiation. Cooperators and Forest Service employees said the appeals process was not an optimum tool for achieving or extending coordinaton because of its adversarial and quasi-legal atmosphere.

This recommendation responds to concerns about the inherent handicaps of adversarial processes, use of the appeal process to accomplish objectives not the subject of the appeal, opinions of some Forest Service personnel that negotiation was illegal prior to decision announcement but legal afterward, inadequacies of communications with cooperators about decisions that would affect them, and inadequate predecision coordination.

Implementation of this recommendation would provide affected cooperators and the Forest Service an opportunity for nonadversarial negotiation and coordination that focuses on the decisions made in forest plans.

## Recommendation 7

***Encourage direct participation of other agencies in the planning process.***

Implementation of this recommendation would require revision of regulations in 36 CFR 219.5(b) and corresponding policy and procedural guidelines; it also would require the use of different techniques in the planning process, in implementation, and in monitoring. There may still be circumstances when other agency personnel can be part of Forest Service interdisciplinary teams.

*Participation* as used here means performance of planning work tasks, such as joint data collection and management, interdisciplinary team membership, performance of analyses, preparation of alternatives, conducting of public meetings and related activites, presentation of briefings, and so forth. Distinction is made among the terms "providing input," "review," "comment," and "true participation as a partner" in the planning process. A major dimension

of encouraging and stimulating participation is clearly defining and communicating the roles and responsibilities of the cooperators documented in the study plan.

This recommendation deals with inconsistent interpretations of policy concerning membership of agency representatives on interdisciplinary planning teams. Where other agency representatives served as members of interdisciplinary planning teams, a high level of understanding and coordination occurred. The recommendation also acknowledges the need for a closer relationship between agencies having responsibilities for resource management.

Implementation of this recommendation could lead to improved relationships between the Forest Service and other agencies, including more understanding and support for land management plans.

## Recommendation 8

***Encourage the development of policy positions by governors on forest plans.***

Implementation of this recommendation would require changes to FSM 1920 policy and corresponding procedural guidelines. Review, and in some cases renegotiation, of existing single-point-of-contact agreements might be necessary.

Changes to regulations, policy, and procedural guidelines should specify that draft forest plans would be formally transmitted only to the governor of the affected State and through that office to State agencies, with a formal request of the governor for a consolidated State policy position. Sufficient time in the comment period would be needed to allow for transmittal to and from the appropriate State agencies and for preparation of the consolidated response. This recommendation is not intended to limit earlier and less formal negotiation and coordination with agency representatives as discussed in Recommendation 6.

In some States, gubernatorial policy responses to forest plan drafts were well coordinated, and unified policy positions were provided. In other cases, inconsistent, and sometimes mutually exclusive, positions were taken by State agency heads and then conveyed to the Forest Service by them and by governors without resolution.

Implementation of this recommendation could strengthen the development of policy positions by States to ensure consistency with their policy objectives, strengthen the administrative positions of governors, provide increased understanding of the concept of tradeoffs in decisionmaking, and increase understanding and support for forest plans.

## Recommendation 9

***Strengthen the distinction among public involvement, interagency coordination, and relationships with elected officials.***

Implementation of this recommendation would require amendment of the regulations in 36 CFR 219.7(d) and corresponding policy and procedural guidelines; it would require the implementation of distinctive coordination activities in the planning process.

This recommendation emphasizes that the objectives of coordination with other agencies and public involvement are different, as noted in 36 CFR 219.7. Because these objectives are different, use of activities specific to the coordination process could enhance its effectiveness. It is envisioned that this would include providing materials to agencies prior to general public distribution. Cooperator input would be considered and incorporated prior to sending the material to the public.

This recommendation responds to concerns that cooperating agencies were treated in the same way as individuals of the public at large, even though some agencies had responsibilities and regulatory authority for resource management on and near the national forests. Most cooperators felt strongly that their role in the planning process should differ from that of the general public.

Implementation of this recommendation would encourage the development of partnership relationships between the Forest Service and other agencies with resource management responsibilities. Increased understanding and support for land management plans could result.

## Recommendation 10

***Determine which Indian treaty rights are preemptive and treat them as such in forest plans.***

Implementation of this recommendation would require revision of the regulations in 36 CFR 219.7(c) and corresponding policy and procedural guidelines to determine preemptive Indian treaty rights and to ensure their appropriate consideration in plans. It would require close coordination with the Office of General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

Indian treaties have the status of agreements between sovereign nations. In some cases, they provide perpetual resource use guarantees to tribes. Where applicable, plans should deal with treaty rights as preemptive of other uses, because they represent prior and continuing commitments of resource use.

This recommendation responds to inconsistent understanding and interpretation of Indian treaty rights by Forest Service line officers and planners and to the concerns of tribal representatives that, in some cases, only "consideration" was given to these outstanding rights.

Implementation of this recommendation would provide an opportunity for participation of Indian tribes in the development of applicable regulations,

policy, and procedures; would clarify requirements or identify areas of uncertainty for further action; and would reaffirm the commitment of the agency to meet obligations of the United States. It also would help develop communications between the Forest Service and tribes that could lead to improved coordination.

## Recommendation 11

***Establish specific coordination procedures for Indian tribes.***

Implementation of this recommendation requires that specific coordination procedures be included in study plans.

Cultural and organizational differences between the Forest Service and Indian tribes require specific coordination procedures. Processes used by the Forest Service in dealing with the public and other agencies were not often workable with Indian tribes. Specific procedures that may be used include—

- Initiate early, direct, and personal contact with tribal leaders.
- Identify elected and spiritual leaders and coordinate with both.
- Specifically address the importance of cultural and religious preservation and of protecting archeological sites.
- Coordinate the handling of Native American artifacts.
- Specify one person for Native American coordination and match that person's cultural background (or training) to the Native Americans.

The recommendation responds to concerns that Forest Service coordination processes were often not culturally sensitive, and therefore ineffective. It also responds to the high level of success where Forest Service planners did use culturally sensitive techniques in the first round of planning.

It is expected that more effective coordination with Indian tribes would result from the implementation of this recommendation.

## Recommendation 12

***Determine whether the Forest Service has a trust responsibility for Indian tribes.***

Implementation of this recommendation would require legal research to clearly identify the trust responsibility, if any, the Forest Service has for Indian tribes. The results should clearly differentiate the responsibilities on and off reservation lands. The results of this determination must be incorporated into planning regulations, policies, and procedures.

This recommendation responds to concerns that the Forest Service has not discharged its trust responsibility to Indian tribes.

It is expected that if this clarification identifies a Forest Service trust responsibility, new legislation and policy direction would establish government-to-government protocol with Indian tribes.

## Recommendation 13

***Establish a 24-month period for the revision of each forest plan.***

Implementation of this recommendation would require policy revision and different planning process implementation strategies.

This recommendation envisions more frequent revisions of forest plans as an ongoing planning process rather than a zero-based planning process that would repeat the process used during development of the initial plans. In some cases, preparation of initial forest plans spanned a 10-year period or longer. There were numerous changes in agencies, personnel, society, and resources. The concept of planning and the expected contents and decisions of plans changed over time because of these factors. Litigative intepretations and appeals decisions also created new expectations of plans. Planning that was once viewed as a periodic activity became a continuing activity. Planning teams became permanent, rather than temporary parts of organizations. Cooperating agencies made adjustments in staffing and budgets to reflect their commitments to participate in Forest Service planning.

This recommendation responds to comments by many that the large amount of change in direction and personnel occurring over the long period it took to prepare the plans impeded coordination. It acknowledges that effective coordination depends on interpersonal factors such as trust, credibility, and professional contacts that are difficult to maintain with transitory organizations.

Implementation of this recommendation should help shift the coordination focus from process to decisionmaking. It would set the stage for improved cooperative relationships, because it would acknowledge the continuing nature of interagency coordination.

## Recommendation 14

***Train cooperator and Forest Service personnel in the land management planning process.***

Implementation of this recommendation would involve training personnel in the land management planning process after the preparation of curricula, lesson plans, visual aids, publications, and other training materials to meet this objective. Training material on the development of interpersonal communication skills and improving sensitivity, awareness, respect, and responsiveness to others should be included. (This recommendation is related to Recommendation 4.)

Interpersonal communication skills and consistency in understanding of the planning process were stressed by many interviewees and workshop participants as essential to effective coordination.

This recommendation responds to concerns about incomplete understanding of the planning process within the Forest Service and externally, types of decisions made in planning documents, linkages of land management planning and project planning, inconsistency among Forest Service units, and ineffective communication.

It is expected that improved understanding of the planning process would result, as well as more use of those coordination techniques that proved effective in the first round of planning.

## Recommendation 15

***Prepare and distribute a summary of coordination requirements in planning-related laws, regulations, and policy.***

A summary and checklist of coordination requirements has been completed; it requires only final edit and distribution to complete action on this recommendation.

There was no available summary of coordination requirements; in the course of evaluating this critique element, one was prepared. It is expected that this information will aid planners in meeting coordination requirements.

## Recommendation 16

***Improve the readability of planning documents.***

Implementation of this recommendation would—

- Require moving the format outlines for environmental impact statements and forest plans in FSH 1909.12 at 4.1 and 4.2 to the Forest Service Manual to make them mandatory.
- Establish an additional requirement for a summary of the forest plan.
- Require a close editing of each document to eliminate Forest Service jargon that makes them hard to understand.

This recommendation emphasizes that the planning documents need to be easier to understand and more consistent in format among forests. This can be accomplished if Forest Service jargon is eliminated from the documents, if forests use the same format, and if easy-to-read summaries of documents are provided. If planning documents were easier to read and understand, coordination would be improved.

Implementation of this recommendation will make planning documents more readable and should enhance the ability of cooperators to become involved in the planning process.

## Recommendation 17 *Continue use of successful coordination techniques.*

Implementation of this recommendation would involve sharing information about the following:

- The involvement of cooperators early and often in the planning process provided better coordination.
- Face-to-face contacts with cooperators worked much better than sending written material for their review and comment. Formal contacts at specified points in the planning process were not effective substitutes for personal, frequent contacts with representatives of cooperators.
- Participation was encouraged by the use of national forest volunteer agreements, as this provided a way to reimburse participants for costs.
- Work groups of cooperators were formed to assist in the scoping process.
- Intergovernmental Personnel Act agreements were used to obtain full-time participation of other cooperators as members of forest interdisciplinary teams.
- Cooperators participated with the Forest Service in conducting public meetings by making presentations and by conducting joint meetings.
- Task forces of cooperators were formed to conduct analyses, draft standards and guides, and prepare alternatives.
- Open houses encouraged informal interaction with planning team members.
- Space was provided in supervisors' offices for cooperators to review planning records.
- Mailings were used to inform cooperators of planning progress, status, and key opportunities for participation.
- Briefings were used to inform elected officials and cooperators. County commissioners in particular expressed approval for the use of briefings.
- Joint data management involved the development of criteria for collection, storage, interpretation, and use.
- Field trips were used to demonstrate the application of standards and guidelines; participants thought this led to a good understanding of the plan and provided opportunities for coordination.
- The assignment of responsibility for liaison and coordination with a particular cooperator worked well.

- The involvement of forest management teams at critical points reinforced and strengthened the coordination effort.

- Forest plan interdisciplinary team leaders were included as full members of the forest management team.

- Annual stragetic planning meetings were conducted with cooperators and followed up with field trips that facilitated further discussion and closer examination of particular areas of interest.

- Native American employees facilitated coordination with Indian tribes.

- Leaders with the following traits were most successful in coordination:
  - Sensitivity to other agencies and local concerns.
  - Strong communication and interpersonal skills.
  - Willingness to listen and to value the information received.
  - Ability to integrate resource considerations in decisionmaking.
  - Ability to recognize the various agencies' roles and responsibilities and to identify and use appropriate coordination approaches.

It is expected that the continued sharing of the above information on a broader base will lead to improved effectiveness of coordination.

# Appendix A
# Interview Questions

## QUESTIONNAIRE
(FOR INTERNAL USE ONLY)

**DATE**

**REGION**

**FOREST**

| PARTICIPANTS | TITLE | POSITION |
|---|---|---|
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ |

**36 CFR 219**

1. Notice of preparation of the land and resource management plan given to State single point of contact (clearinghouse), affected tribal leaders, and county governments when notice of intent sent out. 36 CFR 219.7(b)

   YES NO

2. Meetings held with representatives from other Federal, State, and local governments and Indian tribes at start of process to establish coordination procedures. 36 CFR 219.7(d)

   YES NO

   - How effective were the meetings in establishing a coordination process?

   - What techniques did you use?

3. Identification of issues and concerns and development of planning criteria considered information obtained during coordination with other agencies. 36 CFR 219.12(b),(c)

   YES NO

   - How?

4. Planning and land-use policies of other Federal, State, and local governments and Indian tribes reviewed and results displayed in the environmental impact statement. 36 CFR 219.7(c) Review considered:
   - other agencies' objectives
   - assessment of interrelated impacts
   - determination of how to deal with impacts
   - consideration of alternative ways to deal with conflicts

   YES NO

   - If yes, how did you determine which other agency plans to review?

   - How did you conduct the review?

   - How did the results of these reviews affect the forest plan?

5. Meetings held with other agencies after issues and concerns identified and prior to preferred alternative identified. 36 CFR 219.7(d)

   YES NO

   - If yes, generally, what agencies were involved?

   - What techniques did you use to involve them?

   - How did these meetings affect the forest plan?

   - If you had it to do over, what additional agencies and Indian tribes would you involve? Which, if any, would you not involve?

6. Other agencies and universities were given opportunity to help resolve management problems and identify research needs. 36 CFR 219.7(e)

   YES NO

   - If yes, how useful was the information received?

   - How did it affect the forest plan?

7. Biologists from State and other Federal agencies were consulted in order to coordinate planning for fish and wildlife. 36 CFR 219.19(a)(3)

   YES NO

   - How did you do this?

   - What effect did this have on the forest plan?

8. Plan alternatives coordinated with present and proposed recreation activities on local or State lands, particularly the State comprehensive outdoor recreation plan. 36 CFR 219.21

   YES NO

   - How did you do this?

   - What effect did this have on the forest plan?

9. Plan alternatives coordinated with the Advisory Council of History Preservation, the State cultural resource plan, the State historic preservation office, State archaeologist, and other State and Federal agencies (cultural resources). 36 CFR 219.24, 16 U.S.C. 460f

   YES NO

   - How did you do this?

   - What effect did this have on the forest plan?

10. Estimated receipt shares to State and local governments estimated for alternatives. 36 CFR 219.12(g)

    YES NO

11. Monitoring and evaluation program includes effects of Forest Service management on adjacent lands and effects of management by other agencies and Indian tribes on national forest management. 36 CFR 219.7(f)

YES NO

12. Monitoring requirements include population trends of indicator species in cooperation with State fish and wildlife agencies to the extent possible. 36 CFR 219.19(a)(6)

YES NO

**FSM 1920**

13. Wild and scenic river study done in close cooperation with affected Federal, State, and local agencies, including water resource planning being done on the same river under the Water Resources Act. FSM 1924.03, 16 U.S.C. 1275(a)

YES NO N/A

**FSH 1909.12**

14. Chapter 6 of environmental impact statements contains list of agencies receiving EIS grouped by Federal officials and agencies, Indian tribes, State officials and agencies, local officials and agencies, libraries, organizations, and individuals. 4.16

YES NO

**Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972**

15. Forest plan coordinated with coastal zone management programs. 16 U.S.C. 1456(a)

YES NO N/A

- How? How effective was it?

**Sikes Act**

16. If applicable, coordination occurred with appropriate State agencies on programs under this act (wildlife and fish, mainly threatened and endangered species). 16 U.S.C. 670g(a)

YES NO N/A

- How did you accomplish this? How effective was it?

### Clean Air Act

17. Class 1 air shed area coordinated with Secretary of the Interior. 42 U.S.C. 7491

    YES NO N/A

    - What, if any, additional coordination took place with other agencies regarding this act and the various clean water acts?

    - How was the forest plan affected by this coordination?

### Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

18. When forest plan proposes water impoundments, diversion or deepening, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service occurred. 16 U.S.C. 662(a)

    YES NO N/A

### National Enivronmental Policy Act (NEPA)

19. Consultation occurred and comments received from Federal agencies having jurisdiction or special expertise concerning environmental impacts. 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)

    YES NO N/A

    - How was the forest plan affected?

20. Information concerning the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of environmental quality made available to State and local governmental units and individuals (data sharing). 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(I), 16 U.S.C. 1604(a)

    YES NO N/A

    - Please list some examples.

    - How did this information affect the forest plan?

### Wild and Free-Roaming Horse and Burros Act

21. Cooperation with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) occurred for the protection and management of wild horses and burros on BLM or jointly administered lands. 36 CFR 321.11

    YES NO N/A

    - How?

### Endangered Species Act of 1973

22. Consultation occurred with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 16 U.S.C. 1536

    YES NO N/A

    - If yes, was it formal or informal?

    - What effect did this have on the forest plan?

### American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA)

23. Consultation with Indian tribes occurred regarding Indian religious practices, and information was considered in the forest planning process.

    YES NO N/A

    - If yes, how did you accomplish this?

    - How did this affect the forest plan?

### General

24. What kind of direction did you receive from the regional office or the Washington Office?

    - How useful was it?

    - What kind of guidance would you have liked to have received?

25. How did you organize to accomplish your coordination responsibilities?

    - Did you use a different approach for different levels of government? If so, what was it and why?

26. What would you change:

    - If you had this round of planning to do over?

    - As you begin the update of the existing forest plan?

27. Generally, what worked well for you in achieving coordination with other agencies during development of forest plans?

28. How do you feel officials of the other agencies felt about the coordination that took place (Indian tribe, Federal, State, local)?

    - How well did they cooperate?

29. Did coordination effectiveness vary by resource management function? By agency?

30. You had analytical and nonanalytical tools available with which to develop your forest plan. Did those tools make it easier or harder to coordinate with other agencies?

What additional comments or suggestions do you have regarding coordination with other agencies in the past or in the future?

# Appendix B
# Summary of Planning Requirements for Coordination With Other Agencies (September 1989)

## Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to identify the requirements for coordination with other agencies and Indian tribes during the development of forest plans and regional guides. As stated in *Federal Statutes Affecting the Land Management Planning Functions of the Forest Service Volume II: Analysis and Discussion*, "There is no single statute which serves as an umbrella authority for agency coordination with other federal agencies and state and local agencies. Many statutes either mandate or strongly recommend Forest Service coordination with other agencies. . . . The principal directive for intergovernmental and interagency coordination is found in RPA/NFMA." An attempt has been made to include only those coordination requirements that must occur during preparation of the forest plans and regional guides. There are many other coordination requirements that must occur during forest plan implementation and development of the RPA Assessment and Program. In some cases, there seems to be overlap.

### A. Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act

1. Sec 6. National Forest System Resource Planning—[T]he Secretary of Agriculture (SecAg) shall develop, maintain, and, as appropriate, revise land and resource management plans for units of the National Forest System, coordinated with the land and resource management planning processes of State and local governments and other Federal agencies.

2. SecAg must utilize data from other organizations and avoid duplication of resource assessments and program planning by other Federal agencies. 16 U.S.C. 1604(a)

### B. 36 CFR 219

Regulations developed to direct implementation of Sec 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act.

3. 219.1(b)(9) A guiding principle. . . . Coordination with the land and resource planning efforts of other Federal agencies, State and local Governments, and Indian Tribes.

4. 219.5(a) Team functions include, but are not limited to—

   (3) Implementing the planning coordination activities within the Forest Service and with local, State, and other Federal agencies.

219.7

5. (a) Responsible Line Officer must coordinate Regional and Forest Planning with equivalent and related planning efforts of other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and Indian Tribes.

6. (b) Responsible Line Officer must give notice of preparation of LRMP to the official or agency so designated by the affected States, and to affected Tribal leaders, and county governments. Notice shall be sent out when notice of intent to prepare an EIS is sent and include a general schedule of anticipated planning actions.

7. (c) Responsible Line Officer shall review planning and land use policies of other Federal, State and local governments and Indian Tribes and display the results in the EIS. The review must include:
   (1) Consideration of other agency and Indian Tribe objectives
   (2) Assessment of interrelated impacts of these plans and policies
   (3) Determination of how FS plans should deal with impacts
   (4) Consideration of alternatives when conflicts are identified.

8. (d) Responsible Line Officer will meet with representatives from State, local, and other Federal agencies and Indian Tribes at the beginning of process to establish procedures for coordination. At a minimum other meetings will be held after issues and concerns have been identified and prior to recommending the preferred alternative.

9. (e) Responsible Line Officer shall seek input from other Federal, State and local governments and universities to help resolve management concerns and identify research needs. This input should be included in the discussion of research needs in the Forest Plan.

10. (f) A program of Monitoring and Evaluation will be conducted that includes consideration of the effects of NF land management on land, resources, and communities adjacent to or near NF land, and the effect of management by other agencies on National Forest land management.

219.8 Regional Planning Procedure

11. (b)(3) Responsibilities . . . IDT . . . implements the coordination activities required by 219.7.

219.10 Forest Planning General Procedure

12. (a)(3) Responsibilities . . . IDT . . . implements the coordination activities required by 219.7.

219.12 Forest Planning Process

13. (b) Identification of purpose and need . . . IDT shall identify and evaluate issues, concerns and opportunities including those identified during coordination with other agencies.

14. (c) Planning Criteria . . . specific criteria may be identified from . . .

    (4) The plans and programs of other Federal agencies, State and local governments, and Indian Tribes.

15. (g)(3)(iii) Estimated effects of alternatives . . . must include estimated receipt shares to State and local governments.

219.19 Fish and Wildlife Resource

16. (a)(3) Biologist from State fish and wildlife agencies and other Federal agencies shall be consulted in order to coordinate planning for fish and wildlife. . . .

17. (6) Population trends of indicator species will be monitored in cooperation with State fish and wildlife agencies to the extent possible.

219.21 Recreation Resource

18. (e) Forest Plan alternatives shall be coordinated to the extent feasible with present and proposed recreation activities of local and State land use or outdoor recreation plans, particularly the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan, and already present recreation opportunities on other public and private lands with the aim of reducing duplication in meeting recreational demands.

219.24 Cultural and Historic Resources

19. (c) Formulation and evaluation of alternatives shall be coordinated to the extent feasible with the State Cultural Resource Plan and planning activities of the State Historic Preservation Office and State Archaeologist and with other State and Federal agencies.

**C. FSM 1900**

20. 1922.32 External Review . . . External reviews . . . require . . . coordination with other public planning efforts (219.7). . . . Document results of coordination with other Federal agencies, State and local governments and Indian Tribes.

1924 Wild and Scenic River Evaluation
1924.03 Policy

21. 2. Conduct studies in close cooperation with affected Federal, State and local agencies. Determine possible State participation in preservation and administration of the river if added. . . .

22. Regional Forest invites States to participate jointly in the study of potential wild and scenic rivers.

**D. FSM 2500**

23. 2530.43(2) Coordinate Forest Service water resource inventory, investigations, and monitoring programs among . . . other Federal and State agencies to avoid duplication of effort. . . .

24. 2530.44(5) Maintain liaison with local representatives of State and Federal agencies on watershed management matters, including National Forest System water use and water quality protection.

25. 2580.43(5) Cooperate with Federal, State, and local air regulatory agencies to protect resource values; participate with them in the assessment of air quality needs. . . .

26. 2580.43(6) Ensure that all land and resource management activities comply with all substantive and procedural requirements of Federal, State, interstate, or local air regulatory authorities (42 U.S.C. 7418 (a)).

**E. FSH 1909.12**

27. 4.16 EIS outline chapter 6—List of Agencies . . . to whom copies of EIS are sent. Group recipients by Federal officials and agencies, Indian tribes, State officials and agencies, local officials and agencies, libraries, organizations and individuals.

**F. Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972**

28. Interested Federal agencies may consult with the Secretary of Commerce to coordinate their activities with the Secretary's CZMA activities. 16 U.S.C. 1456(a)

29. Federal agencies may participate with the coastal states in developing their coastal zone management programs. 16 U.S.C. 1455(c)(1)

**G. Sikes Act**

30. SecAg must obtain the cooperation of the appropriate State agencies in the planning, development, maintenance, and coordination of conservation and rehabilitation programs under this act. 16 U.S.C. 670g(a) (Relates to wildlife and fish with primary emphasis on habitat improvement for threatened or endangered species.)

**H. Clean Air Act**

31. The Secretary of the Interior (SecI) must confer with Federal land managers within 6 months of the 1977 act in order to identify Class I areas where visibility is an important value. 42 U.S.C.

**I. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA)**

32. SecAg shall consult with SecI and Secretary of Defense (SecD) and take cooperative action to protect the California Desert Conservation Area with the framework of a program of multiple-use and sustained-yield and maintenance of environmental quality. . . . 43 U.S.C. 1781(b), (h)

33. SecAg must coordinate land use plans for forest lands with land use planning and management programs for Indian tribes. 43 U.S.C. 712

**J. Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act**

34. Whenever the waters of any stream or other body of water are proposed to be impounded, diverted, or deepened . . . agency must first consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with a view to the conservation of wildlife resources. 16 U.S.C. 662(a)

**K. Antiquities Act of 1906, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act of 1935, and National Historic Preservation Act of 1966**

35. All Federal agencies must supply the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation with information relating to the Council's functions regarding historic preservation. 16 U.S.C. 460f

**L. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act**

36. The study of rivers within the national forest system for possible inclusion in the system shall be coordinated with water resource planning on the same river being done under the Water Resources Act. 16 U.S.C. 1275(a)

**M. National Environmental Policy Act**

37. Federal agencies must comply with specific statutory obligations under other statutes relating to environmental quality, cooperation with other agencies, or actions in conjunction with other agencies. 42 U.S.C. 4334

38. Federal government must cooperate with State and local governments and other concerned public and private organizations in carrying out the national environmental policy of NEPA. 42 U.S.C. 4331(a)

39. All agencies must work with the CEQ in developing methods to quantify environmental amenities. 42 U.S.C. 4332 (2)(B)

40. The Federal official preparing the EIS must consult and obtain comments from Federal agencies having jurisdiction or special expertise concerning the environmental impact of the project. 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C)

41. Federal agencies are required to make available environmental information concerning the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of environmental quality to State and local governmental units and individuals. 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(I)

**N. Wild and Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act**

42. Forest Service must cooperate with the BLM for protection and management of wild horses and burros on BLM or jointly administered lands. 36 CFR 321.11

**O. Endangered Species Act of 1973**

43. All Federal agencies must consult and cooperate with the SecI in carrying out the purposes of the act. 16 U.S.C. 1536

**P. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA)**

44. Federal agencies have a duty to "evaluate their policies and procedures with the aim of protecting Indian religious freedoms" (*Hopi Indian Tribes* v. *Block*, 8 ILR 3073, 3076 (D.D.C. June 15, 1981)). The duty to evaluate normally requires that agencies learn about Indian religious practices, consult with Indian leaders and religious practitioners, and consider any adverse impacts on Indian religious practices in their decisionmaking process.

## Sources

The above information came from the following sources:

- Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act—act of August 17, 1974 (88 Stat. 476 as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1600–1614).
- Code of Federal Regulations—Parks, Forests, and Public Property, 36 part 200 to End, revised as of July 1, 1987.
- Federal Statutes Affecting the Land Management Planning Functions of the Forest Service, Volumes I and II, USDA Forest Service, Land Management Planning, July 1982.
- American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) and First Amendment protection of the free exercise of religion, by James Morrison, law clerk, Office of General Counsel, March 27, 1986.
- Forest Service Manual (FSM) 1900, 2500.

**Wise Use of Your Natural Resources**